



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,570	03/11/2004	Perry A. Cohagan	03292.101800.1	2569
66569	7590	09/10/2008	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX) 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				ALVAREZ, RAQUEL
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3688				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,570	COHAGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Raquel Alvarez	3688	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/15/04, 2/2/06, 4/2/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 3/11/2004.
2. Claims 1-12 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Based on Supreme Court precedent ¹ and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. ² If either of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is non a patent eligible process under § 101 and should be rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as drawn to a non-statutory subject matter. The applicant is reciting only method steps such as “receiving... determiningupdating”, the applicant has not recited an apparatus or device to perform these limitations and without apparatus or device these limitations are just mental steps. Mentioning computer in the preamble is not enough, if the body of the claims each of the steps can be performed manually.

In claims 1 and 12 the steps are related to a mental process, which is not patentable. Indeed, it is not tied to another statutory class or does not change or switch

statutory class (such as a particular apparatus or physical module or device) or does not transform the underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. See MPEP §2106.IV.B: *Determine Whether the Claimed Invention Falls Within An Enumerated Statutory Category.*

Examiner suggests applicant inserts a device in one or more steps of the body of the claims in order to overcome this rejection.

¹ Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

² The supreme court recognized that this test is not necessary fixed or permanent and may evolve with technological advances. Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63,71 (1972)

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-21 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of copending Application No. 10/708,568. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '568 application further recites transferring points between accounts, one of the accounts being a charity. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known to transfer accounts between accounts including one of the accounts belonging to a charity in order to allow participants to give back to the charity of their choice by allowing them the convenience of transferring earned points or discounts to a second party. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included transferring points between accounts, one of the accounts being a charity in order to obtain the above mentioned advantage.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scroggie et al. (5,970,469 hereinafter Scroggie).

With respect to claims 1-7, 9-10 Scroggie teaches a method for facilitating earning loyalty points wherein the loyalty points are associated with a geographic area (Abstract).

Maintaining a database for storing geographic area loyalty points in a loyalty account corresponding to a participant (see Figure 15) ; receiving purchase data (col. 14, step 404) ;determining a geographic area related to said purchase data (i.e. the system keep track of the store where the items were purchased)(Figure 15, step 500); determining an amount of geographic area loyalty points based on said geographic area and said purchase data (Figure 15, step 504, incentives are determined based on the customer's past purchases and the retailer id where the purchases have taken place. The incentives being exercised and redeemable at a particular store) (col. 10, lines 5-39) ;and updating said loyalty account with said geographic area loyalty points (Figure 15, step 506).

With respect to claim 8, Scroggie further teaches associating the consumer ID purchase data with a retailer and a manufacturer item identifier (see Figure 1, consumers 10, retailers 12 and manufacturers 14).

With respect to claim 11, Scroggie teaches receiving purchase data from a dual transaction card (i.e. using a check cashing card or a bank card as a promotion loyalty card)(col. 12, lines 14-42).

With respect to claims 12-19, 21 Scroggie teaches a method for facilitating earning loyalty points wherein the loyalty points are associated with a geographic area (Abstract). Maintaining a database for storing geographic area loyalty points in a loyalty account corresponding to a participant (see Figure 15); receiving a request related to a requested geographic redemption area to redeem an amount of said geographic loyalty points (col. 11, lines 57-65); determining if said requested geographic redemption area is associated with said geographic area loyalty points (col. 11, lines 57-65)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scroggie in view of Official Notice.

Claim 20 further recites calculating an exchange rate between geographic areas. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known to have exchange rates and conversion rates between geographic areas. For example, when traveling overseas

and the like, the customer is presented with a list of currency and their corresponding conversion rate in order to provide and aid the customer with the calculation of how much money they will receive for exchanging to the area/geographic currency rate. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included calculating an exchange rate between geographic areas in order to achieve the above mentioned advantage.

Point of contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (571)272-6715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Myhre can be reached on (571)272-6722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/708,570
Art Unit: 3688

Page 8

/Raquel Alvarez/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688

Raquel Alvarez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3688

R.A.
9/4/2008